

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

EYLEEN ARCHIE <i>Plaintiff</i>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
	:	
v.	:	NO. 22-2915
	:	
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, <i>et al.</i>	:	
<i>Defendants</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 16th day of January 2025, upon consideration of Defendants City of Philadelphia’s (the “City”) and Deputy Commissioner Christine M. Coulter’s (“Deputy Commissioner Coulter”) (collectively, “Moving Defendants”) *motion for summary judgment*, (ECF 50), and Plaintiff Eyleen Archie’s (“Plaintiff”) response in opposition, (ECF 51), it is hereby **ORDERED**, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum opinion, that:

1. Moving Defendants’ motion for summary judgment as to all claims asserted against Deputy Commissioner Coulter is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, judgment is entered in favor of Deputy Commissioner Coulter and against Plaintiff on all claims asserted against Deputy Commissioner Coulter. The Clerk of Court is directed to mark this matter terminated as to Deputy Commissioner Christine M. Coulter.
2. Moving Defendants’ motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff’s discrimination claims brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.* (Count I); 42 U.S.C § 1981 (Count III); 42 U.S.C § 1983 (Count V); and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, 43 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 951 *et seq.* (Count VII) is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, judgment is entered in favor of Moving Defendants and against Plaintiff on all claims asserted against them at Counts I, III, V, and VII.

3. Moving Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's retaliation claims brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.* (Count II); 42 U.S.C § 1981 (Count IV); and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, 43 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 951 *et seq.* (Count VII) is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, judgment is entered in favor of Moving Defendants and against Plaintiff on all claims asserted against them at Counts II, IV and VII.
4. Moving Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's retaliation claims under 42 U.S.C § 1983 and premised on the exercise of Plaintiff's First Amendment rights (Count VI) is **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitza I. Quiñones Alejandro

NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO

Judge, United States District Court